Attachment 1
Issues Matrix
Cause No. 41657

Issue[1]	Resolved	Unresolved
A1. Loop Make-Up Information and Interfaces Issues **Provision of IDLC information** **Returned loop makeup information** • **Availability by central office of percentage of loops where constraints in provisioning of xDSL exist**	1. Ameritech will provide CLECs with *preorder* access to actual loop makeup information. 2. The loop makeup information is being provided via EDI and via email as of 5/17/00. 3. The loop makeup information will be provided via GUI by 9/27/00 and will go through the five-state Ameritech state Change Management process 4. The loop makeup information will comply with the requirements of the UNE Remand Order and the results of Advanced Services Plan of Record (POR), including the results of the CLEC collaborative. 5. The EDI, Fax and GUI loop information interfaces will be tested. 6. Central office loop percentages will be made available by 12/2/00 under the Advance Services POR, including information on the percentages of lines in each central office by zip code that are DSL compatible. 8. Ameritech will make improvements to the account management process. (See item Y)	1. AT&T and other CLECs request that some of these interfaces, especially GUI, be implemented more rapidly. *NOTE: Issue of GUI and § 271 is now referenced in footnote 3.* *NOTE: The issue of phased testing has been deferred to the MTP portion of this proceeding and will not be included in this matrix.*

---

[1] For a description of each issue, see the document entitled "Description of A-AA Issues."

[2] Ameritech believes that the GUI interface does not need to be tested prior to qualifying to offer interLATA services under section 271. CLECs disagree with this position. Notwithstanding Ameritech's position regarding 271 approval, Ameritech agrees that the GUI interface must be tested.

	9. Loop selection / assignment and loop build-out will both be tested, and will be compared against retail.	
A2. A new loop assignment process, including voice grade loops served through integrated digital loop carrier equipment as well as xDSL loop prequalification processes. No plans currently exist to provide these functionalities to CLECs who do not use an Electronic Data Interchange system ("EDI"); however, Ameritech will work with the collaborative process to discuss and develop means to make these functionalities available to non-EDI CLECs. • **Loop selection** • **EDI message when no facilities available** • **Loop assignment engineering**	1. Ameritech will provide methods and procedures for all aspects of loop provisioning flow by 6/2/00. 2. The loop selection process will be tested. 3. Ameritech will provide information regarding the facilities availability process improvements due by 6/ 2/00. These improvements will be implemented by June 15, 2000, except for the commitment to notify CLECs of facilities problems within 24 hours of the initial FOC. This aspect of the plan will be implemented not later than September 1, 2000. (See item F for more information.) 4. An accelerated Change Management process will be used based on the five-state Ameritech Change Management process.	1. CLECs have issues with the adequacy of process improvements. 2. CLECs believe improvements must be made to the processes for escalation of problems with loop assignment. The improvements must include Ameritech assuming responsibility for getting lost or missed orders back on schedule. 3. Since Ameritech has not yet issued its "new" methods and procedures, it is impossible for any party to identify specific "unresolved issues;" therefore, all CLEC issues concerning loop selection / assignment process are unresolved. At the very least, CLECs expect the following from a loop selection/assignment process: • a process which gives CLECs timely notice in the ordering process on whether the facility is available, and if not: (a) provides a detailed explanation of why the particular facilities are not available; (b) provides a detailed explanation of the costs and work necessary for provisioning the "unavailable" facilities and the timing for such work to be completed • a detailed escalation account management process • a mechanism to track whether and how Ameritech later provides service on loops previously deemed unavailable to CLECs • the process should mirror as closely as possible the process Ameritech uses to provision its own retail work orders 4. Although loop selection / assignment and loop build-out will both be tested, and will be compared against retail, the meaning of "no facilities available" and whether Ameritech retail has an advantage is

		not resolved. CLECs believe if Ameritech will build, condition or create facilities for its retail customer when no facilities exist, then it should make facilities available to competitors in a similar manner. CLECs want more information on the basis for a no facilities available designation. 5. CLECs are concerned regarding the price associated with loop assignment when Ameritech uses manual processes to determine costs. 6. CLECs want the policy that they will be notified of facilities issues within 24 hours to be implemented shortly after Ameritech implements its improved processes to identify these issues, currently scheduled for June 15, 2000.

A3. CLECs are experiencing high bit error rate problems if Ameritech is using HDSL(2) technology to deliver T-1 service.
    (1) The use of this technology has interfered with CLECs' ability to provision local services.
    (2) The problem is that the HDSL(2) equipment is continuously robbing bits from the 6th, 12th, 18th and 24th frames in order to communicate with the card at the end user location and monitor the circuit. Although such bit robbing does not degrade voice service, it does have an impact on any data services using that channel.
		Ameritech is reviewing these issues.

B. CLECs require a process to order unbundled network element platform ("UNE-P") in commercial volumes for both business and residential customers. No plans currently exist to provide	1. Ameritech will provide a process to order UNE-P in commercial volumes for both business and residential customers. 2. Ameritech has agreed to	1. The parties have not seen the UNE-P tariff, including pricing and other terms and conditions to determine if this is a viable product offering. 2. CLECs oppose any UNE-P

any functionalities to CLECs who do not use an EDI system; however, Ameritech will work with the collaborative process to discuss and develop means to make these functionalities available to non-EDI CLECs. **UNE-P ordering using ASR or Telis/Connect:Direct ™**	tariff UNE-P in Indiana. (UNE-P is currently available by interconnection agreement.) 3. The UNE-P order process is currently available via EDI 4. The UNE-P ordering process will be available via GUI by 3/1/01. 5. The EDI interface will be tested. 6. The GUI interface will be tested, 7. Ameritech will not offer UNE-P via ASR, Telis/Connect:Direct™. 8. The FAX interface will be tested, although parties agree that a FAX ordering interface is not sufficient for commercial volumes.	restrictions such as prohibitions on new installs and second lines. 3. CLECs require the GUI interface to be deployed by September 2000, instead of March 2001, as proposed by Ameritech. 4. CLECs believe that the IURC has the authority to order UNE-P and other combinations under existing state law. Ameritech disagrees. 5. AT&T believes that a separate, manual process for ordering UNE-P is necessary as a fail-safe.
C. An ordering process for adding ADSL functionality to a local loop already being used for voice grade service (i.e., line sharing)	1. Ameritech will provide an ordering process for adding ADSL functionality to loops that are already in use by Ameritech for voice service. 2. The line sharing ordering process will be provided via Fax orders by 6/5/00; EDI and Telis will be available by May 27, 2000; and the GUI will be provided not later than March 1, 2001. 3. The GUI interface will provide the same functionality and process as the EDI interface. 4. The Fax, EDI, and GUI interfaces will be tested, although parties agree that the FAX interface is not sufficient for new products at commercial volumes.	1. CLECs require the GUI interface to be deployed by September 2000, instead of March 2001, as proposed by Ameritech. 2. The parties do not agree on whether line sharing can be used with UNE-P. 3. AT&T states that the line sharing offering--and its terms, conditions and pricing--is necessary and would impact OSS and third-party test. AT&T believes that a product offering and an interface to order Line Sharing with UNE-P must be completed and approved by the Commission prior to third-party testing beginning. Ameritech does not agree with this position. However, Ameritech has agreed to discuss the processes and procedures associated with obtaining an xDSL-capable loop, and if desired, unbundled switching and transport, and then disconnecting the UNE-P arrangement. This would enable the CLEC to provide both voice and

		data on a single xDSL-capable unbundled loop. 4. A statement that ordering line sharing is possible via EDI by 5/27 is not completely accurate. Ameritech does not offer release testing prior to actual release, so the May 27th date is the date that most CLECs will start testing this functionality via EDI. Also, the fax functionality for EDI CLECs is void, since Ameritech has historically refused to send responses to CLECs utilizing EDI by any other method than EDI. In other words, if a CLEC is still testing EDI functionality and is having issues receiving responses, Ameritech will only send faxed order responses via EDI. Ameritech agreed to look into a faxed response solution for faxed orders.
D. A process to order sub-loop unbundling. • **Sub-loop ordering using EDI, ASR and Telis/Connect:Direct ™**	1. Ameritech will provide a process to order sub-loop unbundling. 2. The process for ordering sub-loops via Fax and ASR/Telis is available. 3. The process will be available by EDI, ASR and Telis/Connect:Direct ™ by September 27, 2000 utilizing the five-state Ameritech Change Management process. 4. The process will be available via GUI not later than March 1, 2001. 5. The Fax, EDI, ASR , Telis and GUI interfaces will be tested, although parties agree that the FAX interface is not sufficient for new products at commercial volumes.	1. Ameritech will describe the process to identify the locations of "point of access" to obtain a sub-loop. This will be shared with CLECs by (date to be determined).

E. A process to order dark fiber.	1. Ameritech will provide a process to order dark fiber. 2. Ameritech Indiana will offer dark fiber in response to the UNE Remand Order. 3. The ordering process for dark fiber will be ASR/Telis. There will not be a GUI ordering process.	1. The CLECs have not yet seen the revised dark fiber offering, so they cannot determine whether it complies with the UNE Remand order. Changes in the dark fiber product definition could affect the ordering process.
F. A new firm order confirmation process – including a new order jeopardy notification process for both EDI and non-EDI CLECs. • **FOC: confirmation or commitment date** • **Escalation process when problems occur**	1. Ameritech will incorporate version numbers and reason codes in all revised FOCs beginning September 27, 2000. 2. Ameritech will identify facilities problems within 24 hours of initial FOC beginning on September 1, 2000. Ameritech will do a jeopardy notice with a new committed due date when assignment / facilities problems are identified, except in the case where no suitable facilities exist, and the CLEC would have to give affirmative authority to construct or condition facilities. . 3. Ameritech will investigate whether CLECs can prefile a Letter of Authorization (LOA) authorizing conditioning and new construction charges up to a CLEC selected limit, thus avoiding the delay entailed in getting CLEC approval of such charges. 4. Ameritech will share documents with the participating CLECs and Commission staff on the new firm order process by June 2, 2000. 5. The new FOC process will be tested. 6. The internal LOC process to expedite resolution of	1. Since this process has not yet been worked out between the parties, the CLECs reserve judgment on whether the process will meet the stated objectives 2. CLECs believe escalation issues remain unresolved but will review hot-cut procedures and facilities availability procedures from Ameritech over the next month to determine if these new process and procedures address this issue and meet the stated objectives. 3. CLECs believe if the NECC-LOC finds a problem in the field when processing an order the problems should be fixed and the order should be expedited so service is delivered on or near the FOC date. In such a situation Ameritech should waive its nonrecurring costs and provide the competitor compensation. 4. CLECs believe if Ameritech splits an order that Ameritech should assure that all parts are completed at the same time. 5. The revision to Ameritech's no-facilities policy may require Ameritech to implement additional reason codes to track the different types of responses. Ameritech will investigate this.

	missed cuts will be tested. 7. Ameritech has stated that the first FOC received via either FAX or EDI contains the committed due date	
G. Fail safe Hot-Cut procedures with dial tone and ANI testing completed 48hrs. prior to cut. • **Selection of scheduling time** • **Real time notice of completion of facilities service order**	1. Ameritech will provide fail-safe Hot-Cut procedures with dial tone and ANI testing completed 48hrs. prior to cut. 2. Ameritech will suggest a hot cut process after meeting with CLECs 3. The hot cut process will be provided not later than July 1, 2000. 4. Ameritech agrees to post their hot cut procedures on TCNet as a draft and circulate it at the next users forum on June 15, 2000. Ameritech will issue an accessible letter when procedures are final.	1. CLECs are determining if their switches and systems can accommodate fail-safe Hot-Cut procedures with dial tone and ANI testing completed 48hrs. prior to cut. 2. Operational issues to support frame due time on the LSR are being evaluated. 3. Parties are working on notification to CLECs for completion of facilities within 60 minutes. 4. Parties are developing a process whereby trouble reports which occur within 24 hours after the cut are handled by the provisioning center. 5. CLECs want trouble report updates every hour. Ameritech has committed to status reports every 4 hours or when status changes. 6. Ameritech is developing an expedited process to restore service back to Ameritech within 24 hours of a problem associated with a scheduled coordinated cut. 7. Ameritech is developing hot-cut procedures for *x*DSL.
H. The Street Address Guide ("SAG") and Customer Service Record ("CSR") will be synced up. (In other words, CSRs will be compared to the SAG, and errors in the CSRs will be corrected).	1. Ameritech will do an abbreviated validation on all orders which include a telephone number of an existing Ameritech service. The abbreviated validation will only validate the first field in the address. This change will be implemented by September 2000. 2. Parties agree that the	1. The parties do not agree on whether Ameritech is able to sync CSR to SAG. AT&T wants, at a minimum, a one-time scrub of the database to eliminate existing problems. 2. Ameritech will investigate whether abbreviated validation will work for a customer with existing service but requesting a new line.

	Uniform and Enhanced OSS Collaborative may modify this proposal.	3. Parties require additional information before they can evaluate whether abbreviated validation meets their needs.
I. Parsed CSRs will be provided.	1. Ameritech will provide parsed CSRs. Parsed CSRs will be provided as part of LSOG 4 pre-ordering/ordering implementation by March 2001. 2. Parsed CSRs will be tested.	1. CLECs want parsed CSRs prior to March 2001. 2. AT&T believes testing cannot start until full functionality, including parsed CSRs, is implemented. 3. Ameritech states that full LSOG 4 deployment, including Parsed CSR, is not possible before March 2001 but has not investigated the possibility of deploying the parsed CSR functionality, apart from LSOG 4, before the end of the year. 4. Ameritech states that the format of the parsed CSR will be consistent with SBC's current ELMS 4 compliant interface and include the parsed address. AT&T requests that the parsed CSR use the ELMS4 standards for all parts of the CSR. Parties will investigate whether SBC meets ELMS4, or whether other agreed-upon standards will be used.
J. Implement industry standard versions of EDI (Version 10) and LSOG (Version 4) for ordering, including all associated functionalities by August 2000.	1. LSOG 4 ordering including jeopardy notification shall be implemented no later than March 2001 2. Most of the exceptions to the LSOG4 standard will be discussed and agreed to in the FCC's Uniform and Enhanced OSS Interface Collaborative. 3. LSOG 4 will be tested.	1. Parties disagree about whether certain functionalities should be included in LSOG4, and whether these should even be discussed by the FCC's Uniform and Enhanced OSS Collaborative for LSOG4. These include parsed CSR, complex completions, single order for DL, preorder/order synchronization, full refresh of supplemental orders and jeopardy notification. 2. The CLECs believe that parsed CSR, complex completion and jeopardy notification functionality must be available via the ordering interface by the end of 2000. Ameritech states that full LSOG 4 deployment is not possible before March 2001 but has not investigated the possibility of deploying these functionalities, apart from LSOG 4, before the end of the year.

		4. AT&T believes that implementation of industry-compliant LSOG 4 with full functionality must be completed before testing begins.
K. Implement an industry standard version of LSOG (Version 4) for preordering.	1. Ameritech has committed to implementing an industry standard LSOG 4 for pre-ordering by March 2001, including parsed CSR. 2. This functionality will be tested.	1. Parties disagree about whether certain functionalities should be included in LSOG4, and whether these should even be discussed by the FCC's Uniform and Enhanced OSS Collaborative for LSOG4. These include parsed CSR, complex completions, single order for DL, preorder/order synchronization, full refresh of supplemental orders and jeopardy notification. 2. The CLECs require parsed CSR functionality in the ordering interface by December 2000. Ameritech has not determined whether this functionality can be delivered outside of LSOG4 to meet that deadline. 3. AT&T believes that implementation of industry-compliant LSOG 4 with full functionality must be completed before testing begins.
L. Directory assistance and publishing (listing) • **Ability to use a single interface** • **Simplification of "retain current listing" orders** • **Listing verification** • **Consistency of DP with DA listings** • **Trouble resolution procedures** • **Improved customer notification via TCList Link;** • **Caption listings submission process** • **Website updating and change processes; password access issue**	1. All aspects of the directory assistance and directory publishing interfaces will be tested, except for those involving yellow pages display ads. 2. Ameritech agrees to eliminate the need for two interfaces by September, 2001. A single interface that is integrated into the current loop ordering processes, including ASR/Telis, will be provided not later than September 1, 2001. 3. Ameritech will implement a process to allow CLECs the option to retain current listings on all orders, except partials, by March 2001. Ameritech is reviewing its ability to advance the implementation of	1. CLECs believe that a single interface should be implemented by January, 2001. 2. Ameritech believes that testing will identify and resolve DA/DP problems. CLECs require DA/DP problems to be fixed prior to testing. 3. The CLECs cannot evaluate Ameritech position prior to obtaining detailed proposals and policy papers. 4. Ameritech still has follow-up issues.

	this process. 4. Ameritech will provide the current SBC "retain current listings" specification by June 1, 2000. This policy will be that currently used by SBC. 5. Ameritech will provide copies of the existing Ameritech Publishing order and query processes. 6. Ameritech will improve coordination between account team and directory publishing and directory assistance personnel.	
M. E911 database management • **Identification of differences between master street address (MSAG) as needed by municipalities for 911-entry and SAG info.**	1. The MSAG database is developed by the municipalities and maintained by a contractor. The format of the MSAG is set by the county which runs the 911 service. 2. CLECs are having 911 updates rejected because of differences in the format the CLECs must use to submit orders to Ameritech and to the 911 administrators. 3. Ameritech states that it has similar problems in submitting 911-address information.	1. Ameritech contends that it cannot conform SAG to MSAG. Other parties contend that it could do so. This issue may be resolved to the satisfaction of CLECs through the information to be provided in Issue H.
N. Scheduled access to customer's premises • **Ability to convey end user information** • **Ability to escalate problems without resubmission of order**	1. Ameritech will ensure that its service technicians will use the access information provided by CLECs, and will ensure that the LOC will expedite any orders missed if technicians do not use the provided access information. 2. Ameritech will provide copies of this policy to the CLECs. 3. Ameritech completed additional training of service technicians in the LOC to ensure compliance in February	1. TDS Metrocom and other CLECs are reviewing complaint logs to determine if this problem is still occurring.

	2000.

4. Ameritech's process regarding access to customer premises will be tested.

5. Ameritech agrees that CLECs should not have to resubmit orders that have not been completed because Ameritech technicians did not obtain access during the scheduled period when valid access instruction was provided and not followed. | |
| **O. Replacement of internal NIDs for residential customers** | 1. Ameritech's existing policy is that whenever an internal NID is found, it will be moved outside, time permitting.

2. Ameritech's revised policy will ensure movement of internal NIDs to external on all CLEC dispatches . Ameritech's revised policy will recall technicians to any premises that does not have an external NID. This policy will be implemented by September 30, 2000.

3. This policy will be part of the test. | 1. CLECs believe that a suitable performance measure is required. Ameritech does not believe that a performance measure is warranted because any measure would be highly subjective. |
| **P. Notification of Change/TCNet**

- **Input from CLECs in change management process** | 1. Ameritech will implement the SBC policy on accessible letters for all changes. The new policy will be implemented by September 30, 2000.

2. Ameritech will provide both before and after images of accessible letters, and a Change Log of TCNet.

3. The CLEC Forum will work to resolve any open issues regarding TCNet change management. | 1. CLECs have a concern over the treatment of items removed from TC Net, and will review the new policy before agreeing that this, and other, issues are resolved.

2. CLECs have concerns about the change management process for non-OSS issues. This issue will be addressed in the Users Forum. |
| **Q. LEC Protection**

- **Method to communicate LOA** | 1. Ameritech has suspended its LEC Protect program for states other than Michigan. It is reviewing whether or not to | 1. The CLECs have concerns about the policies for LOAs and LEC Protect customers. |

for facilities based customers	implement this program in Indiana. 2. Ameritech has not developed policies for submitting LOAs for LEC protected customers. Ameritech will not implement this program before all procedures for handling LEC Protection and submitting required LOAs have gone through the change management process.	2. The CLECs believe that this policy directly affects their ability to place and process orders, and is therefore at issue in this docket. Ameritech contends that this issue is not appropriate for this docket. 3. The CLECs feel the LEC Protection program, if implemented, would harm competition. Ameritech feels that might benefit customers: this is part of Ameritech's review process. 4. The CLECs seek assurance that, if the issue of the anti-competitive effects of LEC Protection are not included in this docket, the CLECs will have an opportunity to present those arguments to the Commission prior to LEC Protection going into effect. 5. Ameritech is reviewing whether it will agree to defer completion of the LEC Protect program for a certain period of time (e.g., until December 31, 2000).
R. Service Order Completion • **Identification of actual changes entered**	1. Ameritech will implement a process to allow review of all (pending/submitted/ completed) service orders for all products through the online provisioning interface by March 1, 2001. 2. Ameritech will not provide an image of the service orders with completion notices, unless it is agreed to in the Uniform and Enhanced OSS collaborative on LSOG4.	1. CLECs have concerns about the extent of information available through this process. 2. CLECs have concerns about service orders being divided and some parts being completed before others. This could lead to some loops being switched to a CLEC before the CLEC learns of the change. CLECs wish to receive confirmation notices that indicate when each party of a divided order is completed. 3. CLECs still require complex completions.
S. Flow Through • **Identification of business rules in order to improve flow through.** (flowthrough means processing the entire order	1. Ameritech will provide detail on what products and types of service orders flowthrough. 2. Ameritech, as part of the 12 month review, will identify flowthrough initiatives and update the flowthrough	1. CLECs require a performance measure that is based on total orders versus orders that are "flow-through eligible." 2. Parties have differing definitions of what flowthrough means, for the purposes of measurement. Separate measures may be necessary for

electronically.)	information in the change management system and online by September 30, 2000. Ameritech has made a draft document available 3. Appropriate flowthrough measures will be developed.	flowthrough in the service center and in other systems. 3. CLECs want online information concerning why orders do not flow through. (Information is being provided in the Indiana collaborative, and should be provided on TCNet.) The adequacy of this information must be determined.
T. Supplemental Orders **Resubmit whole order, just changes, or whole order with changes added.**	1. Ameritech systems will be supplemented to allow for full refresh by September 2001.	1. CLECs require this functionality earlier.
U. Preorder/Order Synchronization • **Identification of elements that won't synchronize after LSOG4 implementation**	(See comments on Parsed CSR, Issue I, for more information.)	(See comments on Parsed CSR, Issue I, for more information.) 1. Ameritech believes that its existing systems provide for pre-order/order integration. Several CLECs have either integrated information from Ameritech's pre-order and order interfaces themselves, or are using a 3rd party software package to do so. For this reason, Ameritech believes that Parsed CSR provides the CLECs additional assistance in integrating pre-ordering and ordering.. 2. CLECs do not believe that Ameritech's preordering and ordering systems are integrated in the manner required by the FCC and believe that synchronization of data elements (in addition to the Parsed CSR) is required. 3. Parties disagree on an appropriate implementation date.
V. Enhanced extended links • **Definition of product to be tested**	1. This issue overlaps with UNE-P. 2. Parties agree that Ameritech must convert Special Access circuits to EELs as defined by the FCC in its UNE Remand Supplemental Order.	1. This issue is being worked in Michigan. 2. CLECs believe that Ameritech must allow ordering of these circuits as EELs, instead of requiring them to be ordered as special access and then converted to EELs. Ameritech believes that it is only required to convert existing circuits to EELs, not to provision new circuits as

		EELs. This issue is in the 8th circuit court at present.
		3. CLECs disagree with Ameritech that no new combinations are required until the 8th Circuit issues an Order on FCC Rule 3.15(c).
		4. Since the product is not defined, CLECs still have concerns about the product definition and price.
		5. Ameritech has a process for converting Special Access circuits to EELs posted on TC Net. CLECs believe that this process is inadequate.
W. Branded operator services	1. Ameritech currently provides this capability with dedicated trunk access now. 2. Ameritech will announce the availability of OS/DA Branding via the Service Provider Id (SPID) by August 1, 2000. This eliminates the need for dedicated trunking.	1. MCI will review whether this is sufficient.
X. Partial Migrations • **Methods and procedures**	1. Ameritech's partial migration intervals are the same as for other changes. 2. Ameritech will keep its operational process regarding Partial Migrations, and not adopt the SBC policy.	1. CLECs oppose any rearrangements fee that may be imposed by Ameritech.
Y. Account Management	1. Ameritech reviewed the account management process during May and agreed to augment the Account Management and Service Management functions by developing a handbook which details account and service management responsibilities, and by hiring additional personnel.	1. CLECs will provide Ameritech with a list of functions that should be included in the handbook. 2. Ameritech will provide an edited version of the handbook to CLECs to ensure that CLEC concerns have been included. This will be available by August 1, 2000. 3. CLECs will need to review the handbook and policies before agreeing that their concerns have been addressed. 4. CLECs feel this process should result in the creation of an engineering czar to handle escalation of facilities issues. The

		Ameritech plan does not call for creation of such a position. However, the Service Management augmentation process may resolve this issue.
Z. Collocation Ordering, Rates, Auditing and Record keeping Processes • **Collocation ordering is uncertain due to the lack of tariffed rates and clear processes for ordering.** • **Difficulty exists regarding the proper payment for the COBO.** **(1) COBO charge is not available as a non-recurring charge and is required at the RECURRING TELRIC rate.** **(2) The charge would at least treble the prior COBO charges.** • **CLECs need a clear path to determine the cost of a new collocation and terms for payment. CLECs require audits on request of equipment availability and status.** • **Notice of ownership change of equipment must be properly processed**.		Ameritech is reviewing these issues.
AA. LNP 10-Digit Trigger (TDT) Ordering • **Full implementation of LNP 10-digit trigger should include appropriate order forms in support of the functionality.** • **Time Warner (TWTC) has requested, but has not received, improved intervals associated with TDT.** • **TWTC has a concern about the reassignment of ported numbers by**		1. Ameritech is reviewing these issues.

Ameritech to Ameritech customers after the numbers were ported to TWTC customers.		
(1) Ameritech has provided a description of a "process" that seems to have been employed in SBC territory and committed to its application in the Ameritech region.		
(2) TWTC has not received any validation that the process is in place.		
(3) Number reassignment corrupts the caller-ID database and Ameritech is unwilling/unable to remove the corruption when it returns the improperly reassigned numbers. The removal of the caller-ID corruption is a process that should be automatically linked to the correction of the improper reassignment.		